



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,004	05/03/2001	John J. Cira	9041.00	5665

26889 7590 09/29/2006

MICHAEL CHAN  
NCR CORPORATION  
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD  
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3653

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/848,004

**Applicant(s)**

CIRA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jeffrey A. Shapiro

**Art Unit**

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-57 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 48-57 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 52 and 56 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested that "allows" be changed to "allowing". Appropriate correction is required.
2. Claim 55 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested that "directs" be changed to "directing". Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claim 57 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested that in the third line, after the word "when" and before the word "driven", the word "being" be inserted. Also, in line three, "provides" be changed to "providing". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 48-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copenhaver et al (US 5,859,726) in view of Petersen et al (US 5,225,978), further in view of Boss (US 6,568,675 B1) and still further in view of Bastian, II et al (US 6,650,225 B2).

Regarding Claims 48, 49 and 54, Copenhaver discloses a check processing apparatus (DH) with MICR printers (1-18), bins (14a-n), and encoding means (MICR printers), encoded documents (checks) with encoded information (MICR) read by

compiler sensor (21,21') and compiler controller (1-110). See Copenhaver, col. 3, lines 40-67 and col. 4, lines 21-26 and figures 6-8.

Copenhaver does not expressly disclose, but Petersen discloses both a balancing module (213) and a reconciliation module (470) which communicate by modems (457) with host computer (400), which is analogous to Applicant's second communication interface. See figures 1-4, col. 8, lines 45-62 and col. 18, lines 28-44.

Note that the host (400) can communicate with other outside systems through data communication module (435). See col. 18, lines 21-27.

Master server workstation (451) is analogous to Applicant's subserver, since this server communicates and manages data from the balancing and reconciling modules and passes them on to the host.

Copenhaver does not expressly disclose, but Boss further discloses document bins (26, 28 and 30) which are removable, and contain electronic identification tags which contain information on the documents contained in said bins, said information being accessed by the document processing control system. See Boss, col. 3, lines 30-65.

Copenhaver does not expressly disclose, but Bastian discloses using a wireless bin module (101) which has an information display (135). See figures 1-4f and 7 as well as col. 13, lines 12-23. Bastian further discloses a first communication interface in the form of either computer/cpu/processor (20) with communication section (22) or in the form of access point module (61). See Bastian, col. 5, line 42-col. 6, line 41. Bastian discloses second communication interface at element (32) in col. 5, lines 46-48) and

Art Unit: 3653

element (71) in col. 9, lines 37-53. Regarding the “physical checks” referred to in the independent claims can be construed as being the “routing operations” or “operating instructions” disclosed by Bastian at col. 6, lines 17-25. Note also in col. 7, lines 5-9, that both text and graphics are described as being displayed on LCD panel (35f).

Regarding Claims 51, 55 and 56, Bastian discloses a first manually-operable button (36) or (136) that directs the CPU to display information in sequential screens. Note that once the service or task is complete, the operator presses this button, after which information regarding the next pick are displayed. Each new display of information is construed as a “new screen”. See Bastian, col. 6, lines 1-11

Regarding Claims 52 and 56, Bastian discloses a second manually-operable button coupled to the processor/CPU that allows operator input concerning actual pick count taken from a bin. Pressing this button causes this adjusted pick count to be transmitted to first communication interface (22) and (61). See col. 6, lines 28-40.

Regarding Claims 53 and 57, Bastian discloses means to create an audible alert signal from speaker (37), as disclosed at col. 7, lines 10-28.

Copenhaver and Boss are considered to be analogous art because they all concern document processing.

Copenhaver and Bastian are considered to be analogous art because Copenhaver concerns document processing which produces documents that require inventory management and Bastian concerns inventory management of storage areas such as shelves, drawers or bins. See Bastian, col. 3, lines 4-8.

Copenhaver and Petersen are considered analogous art because they both concern check processing systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated reconciliation and balance stations connected to a subserver, as taught by Petersen, in the system Copenhaver.

The suggestion/motivation would have been because Copenhaver discloses a check processing apparatus and Petersen provides details of the balancing and reconciling stations that one ordinarily skilled in the check processing art would include in order to process checks. Petersen provides further motivation in the abstract, at col. 2, lines 33-47 and at col. 4 line 60-col. 5, line 23. See Boss, col. 3, lines 30-col. 4, line-38. These passages discuss the automation of previously manual integral banking processes related to check processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used removable document bins having electronic identification tags, as taught by Boss, in the system Copenhaver.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide removable bins which can be moved from machine to machine or station to station for further document processing or document dispensing. See Boss, col. 3, lines 30-col. 4, line-38. Note also that although Copenhaver does not expressly disclose details of physical document storage, it would have been obvious to use Boss' bins so as to store processed checks

Art Unit: 3653

in Copenhaver since Copenhaver's device processes checks and would have required a bin in which to gather and store them.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used wireless "bin modules" with second communication means on the bins of Copenhaver, said bin modules interfacing with a control computer having first communications means, as taught by Bastian.

The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide wireless communication with the remote computers or controllers of Copenhaver to reduce wired connections, increase flexibility and reduce installations and maintenance costs. See Bastian, col. 1, line 65-col. 2, line 6 and col. 9, lines 42-49. With regards to Claims 38, 42 and 46, Bastian at col. 7, lines 19-24 provides motivation for providing auditory alarms so as to "provide a faster cue th[a]n would a visual signal".

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/18/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As discussed above, Copenhaver discloses a check processing system. Petersen further discloses details of balancing and reconciling stations which communicate with each other as well as with a subserver. Said subserver then communicates to other systems, such as a host computer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to communicate either a "reconciliation complete" or "balance complete" signal to the RFID tags and displays taught by Boss and Bastian of a particular cassette with batches of checks. Note that such completion signals are

analogous to any "process complete signal" and would have been obvious in light of Copenhaver and Petersen's teachings concerning check processing.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.


Art Unit: 3653

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571)272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JAS 

September 25, 2006

  
PATRICK MACKEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600